



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/287,478	04/06/1999	CHRISTIAN STIG RODE	RCI001 V1	6350

7590 09/09/2002

RODE CONSULTING INC  
2412 STEARNS HILL ROAD  
WALTHAM, MA 02451

EXAMINER

PHAN, THAI Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2123

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/287,478

Applicant(s)  
Christian Rode

Examiner  
Thai Phan

Art Unit  
2123



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 14, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office action is responsive to applicant's amendment filed on June 14, 2002 to the related patent application S/N: 09/287,478. Claims 1-10 are pending in this official action.

#### ***Specification***

1. Acknowledgment has been made for the submission of materials related to content of specification on page 2 of the present application.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. Due to amendment to claim 7, the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has been withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Huben et al., patent no. 5,959,201, in view of Burrows et al., patent no. 6,397,117 B1.

As per claim 1, Van Huben discloses method and system for computerized design automization using inter-networking (e.g. World Wide Web) for transmitting design or simulation data very similar to the claimed invention (Abstract, "Summary of the Invention"). According to Van Huben, the design simulation and verification method includes steps of creating a transmission network including clients, servers, etc., wherein network clients carrying unique identifier as addressing as example, transmitting structure design data, accepting data from at least one client (col. 9, line 41 to col. 10, line 20) , merging form data with other data including template data for concurrent processing, processing merged data for output, simulating functional design with merged data using user interactive window program, and transmitting design simulation data to client as claimed (col. 6, lines 54-67, col. 9, line 53 to col. 11, line 55, col. 16, line 33 to col. 18, line 64, col. 20, line 27 to col. 22, line 65, cols. 33, 44-45, 51, 85-88). Van-Huben does not expressly disclose web browser as claimed. Web browser in a computer network for browsing data for use in circuit simulation is well-known in the art. Burrows teaches method and system for simulating a circuit design over a computer network which uses web servers, clients and web browser in the user interface to browser desire data for circuit design (Summary of the Invention, Figs. 3-5, cols. 4-5 for description) to maintain, update, pace up with current design technology without significantly increasing cost of user computing requirements as taught in the Background of the invention.

This would motivate practitioner in the art to combine Burrows teaching of using web browser with current update technology in the design and simulation of circuit design over a computer network as disclosed for instance in VanHuben to take advantages of design data changes, maintaining cost, latest data update, etc. over available network resources as in the Summary of the invention.

As per claim 2, Van Huben also required some of steps in claim 1 being repeated for design changes or for a new design.

As per claim 3, Van Huben and Burrows disclosed various user interface implemented in different operating system, wherein such implemented user interface would also include net browser (Burrows).

As per claims 4-6, Burrows taught unique identifier for each client/server, and data encoded for CRC or for checksum which is well-known in network protocols as claimed.

As per claim 7, Burrows teaches method for managing and distributing resource in a computer web for circuit design and simulation with feature limitations as claimed. Burrows teaches circuit simulation resources for management include simulation databases, simulation records (cols. 3-4), records associated with executable design database which would typically include unique identification (col. 4) for database set, design record (database) update to current for later use, etc. as claimed (Summary of the Invention, col. 4, line 5 to col. 6, line 27).

As per claim 8, Van Huben discloses process prioritized for scheduling.

As per claim 9, Van Huben and Burrows disclose transmitting design data to clients which would include form structure data, accepting the structure data, simulating the design data, and synthesizing the design according to design data flow.

As per claim 10, due to the similarities of claim 10 to claim 1 as well disclosed in Van Huben in view of Burrows; therefore, claim 10 is also rejected under the same rationale as set forth.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's argument Van Huben fails to disclose web-based simulation as in the present claimed invention (pages 5-6), the examiner agrees with. Web-based simulation in a computer network is however known in the art. Burrows teaches method and system for simulating a complex circuit design over a network (Abstract, and Summary of the Invention). The simulation is based on web servers, web clients, and user interactive tools such as Web browser (Abstract, Summary of the Invention, Figs. 3-5, col. 4, lines 19-27, col. 4, line 33 to col. 5, line 64, col. 6, lines 5-27).

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. Patent no. 6,002,871, issued to Duggan et al., on Dec. 14, 1999
2. Patent no. 6,005,568, issued to Simonoff et al., on Dec. 21, 1999
3. Patent no. 6,170,014 B1, issued to Durago et al., on Jan. 2, 2001
4. Patent no. 6,353,898 B1, issued to Wifel et al., on Mar. 5, 2002

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thai Phan whose telephone number is (703) 305-3812.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Application/Control Number: 09/287,478  
Art Unit: 2123

Page 7

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

September 3, 2002



KEVIN J. TESKA  
SUPERVISORY  
PATENT EXAMINER